

VICTOR BIERMAN, PhD, Vol I, 4-14-09

Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

W. A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his )  
capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL )  
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and )  
OKLAHOMA SECRETARY OF THE )  
ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT, )  
in his capacity as the )  
TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES )  
FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, )

Plaintiff, )

vs. )

TYSON FOODS, INC., et al, )

Defendants. )

4:05-CV-00329-TCK-SAJ

- - - - -

VOLUME I OF THE VIDEOTAPED  
DEPOSITION OF VICTOR BIERMAN, PhD, produced as  
a witness on behalf of the Plaintiff in the above  
styled and numbered cause, taken on the 14th day of  
April, 2009, in the City of Tulsa, County of Tulsa,  
State of Oklahoma, before me, Lisa A. Steinmeyer, a  
Certified Shorthand Reporter, duly certified under  
and by virtue of the laws of the State of Oklahoma.

TULSA FREELANCE REPORTERS  
918-587-2878



## VICTOR BIERMAN, PhD, Vol I, 4-14-09

Page 186	Page 188
<p>1 identify that document for the Record?</p> <p>2 A Paper published in transactions of the ASAE,</p> <p>3 which is the American Society of Agricultural</p> <p>4 Engineers. Title is Modeling -- it was 2005. Title</p> <p>5 is Modeling the Average Annual Nutrient Losses of 03:36PM</p> <p>6 Two Watersheds in Indiana Using GLEAMS-NAPRA, and</p> <p>7 that is N-A-P-R-A.</p> <p>8 Q Are you familiar with this paper, sir?</p> <p>9 A I've read this paper. The senior author is a</p> <p>10 Adeuya, if I'm pronouncing that correctly, and Dr. 03:36PM</p> <p>11 Engel was the third author.</p> <p>12 Q All right, sir. Are you familiar with the</p> <p>13 American Society of Agricultural Engineers?</p> <p>14 A I know what it is. I'm not intimately</p> <p>15 familiar with it. I'm not a member. 03:36PM</p> <p>16 Q Are you familiar with the publications of that</p> <p>17 organization?</p> <p>18 A I've read some of them, yes.</p> <p>19 Q Do you know whether or not they're peer</p> <p>20 reviewed? 03:36PM</p> <p>21 A I don't know if all of them are peer reviewed,</p> <p>22 but I believe this one here is peer reviewed.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. In this particular paper, did the</p> <p>24 authors and investigators use GLEAMS on a watershed</p> <p>25 scale basis? 03:37PM</p>	<p>1 Q Would you turn to Page 1742, sir?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Under model calibration -- do you see that on</p> <p>4 the left-hand column?</p> <p>5 A Yes. 03:38PM</p> <p>6 Q Under hydrology, would you read the first</p> <p>7 statement there, sir?</p> <p>8 A The historical flow data were divided in two</p> <p>9 parts. The first half of the data, 1975 through</p> <p>10 1976, was used for calibration of hydrology, and the 03:39PM</p> <p>11 second half, in paren, 1977 through 1978, was used</p> <p>12 for validation.</p> <p>13 Q So in this particular situation the</p> <p>14 investigators performed both a calibration and a</p> <p>15 validation step? 03:39PM</p> <p>16 A They described what they did as calibration</p> <p>17 and validation.</p> <p>18 Q And they divided the data in half in order to</p> <p>19 do that?</p> <p>20 A They divided -- they say they divided the data 03:39PM</p> <p>21 into half in order to do what they said they did.</p> <p>22 Q Is that the same approach employed by Dr.</p> <p>23 Engel in the IRW analysis?</p> <p>24 A I don't know if he divided the data in half,</p> <p>25 but my recollection from his expert report is that 03:39PM</p>
Page 187	Page 189
<p>1 A I can't recall. This is one of many papers</p> <p>2 that I've read. I would have to read it again in</p> <p>3 order to answer that question. The authors, of</p> <p>4 course, use GLEAMS. I can't recall the details</p> <p>5 sitting here, sir. 03:37PM</p> <p>6 Q Okay, and it was for a watershed; correct, the</p> <p>7 title would indicate that?</p> <p>8 A Well, the title indicates that. That doesn't</p> <p>9 tell me what's inside of it --</p> <p>10 Q Okay. 03:37PM</p> <p>11 A -- in detail.</p> <p>12 Q I appreciate that, sir. If you would, turn to</p> <p>13 Page 1741.</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q Table 2 at the bottom right-hand, what land 03:38PM</p> <p>16 uses were evaluated using the GLEAMS model in this</p> <p>17 investigation?</p> <p>18 A In Table 2 it indicates the following land</p> <p>19 uses: Corn, farmstead, pastures/grass, small</p> <p>20 grains, soybean, urban/residential, woodland. 03:38PM</p> <p>21 Q Okay. So this particular GLEAMS analysis</p> <p>22 included both urban runoff and forest or woodland</p> <p>23 runoff; is that correct?</p> <p>24 A Well, I don't know that. I just know what I</p> <p>25 read in Table 2. 03:38PM</p>	<p>1 he split the data for the time period 1998 through</p> <p>2 2006 into a time period -- into two time periods,</p> <p>3 and he calibrated -- used one for calibration and</p> <p>4 used the other for his purported validation.</p> <p>5 Q Below that statement, sir, it talks about how 03:40PM</p> <p>6 GLEAMS was calibrated. Do you see where it says</p> <p>7 that in the middle of that paragraph, GLEAMS is</p> <p>8 calibrated?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q Would you read that, sir? 03:40PM</p> <p>11 A GLEAMS was calibrated using observed data from</p> <p>12 the automatic water quality samplers at the outlet</p> <p>13 of Smith-Fry and Driesbach.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. Did Dr. Engel employ a similar process</p> <p>15 in the Illinois River by using -- calibrating a 03:40PM</p> <p>16 GLEAMS at the outlet from the water streams where</p> <p>17 the runoff was collected?</p> <p>18 A We need to be more specific here. Dr. Engel's</p> <p>19 GLEAMS model for the Illinois River watershed</p> <p>20 computed phosphorus -- excuse me. It computed flow 03:41PM</p> <p>21 and phosphorus at edge of field. He did not compare</p> <p>22 the computations for hydrology or edge of field</p> <p>23 phosphorus loads to data at edge of field.</p> <p>24 Q Okay, but in this particular paper, the</p> <p>25 calibration was done at the outlet for the GLEAMS 03:41PM</p>

48 (Pages 186 to 189)

## VICTOR BIERMAN, PhD, Vol I, 4-14-09

Page 190	Page 192
<p>1 runoff, correct, in this paper?</p> <p>2 A Well, that's what it says, but I don't know</p> <p>3 where that outlet was in relationship to the field</p> <p>4 or the HRU or the HRUs being modeled without reading</p> <p>5 the rest of the paper. 03:41PM</p> <p>6 Q Okay. Dr. Engel in his approach in the IRW</p> <p>7 calibrated the runoff on GLEAMS, the GLEAMS portion,</p> <p>8 looking at the outlet of phosphorus contributions at</p> <p>9 the end of Illinois River, Baron Fork and Cane</p> <p>10 Fork; correct? 03:42PM</p> <p>11 A He did compare the output of his GLEAMS model,</p> <p>12 plus the wastewater treatment plant loads, to his</p> <p>13 observed computed total phosphorus loads at the</p> <p>14 three outlet stations.</p> <p>15 Q And that's how he performed his calibration on 03:42PM</p> <p>16 the GLEAMS?</p> <p>17 A He stated that that is how he performed his</p> <p>18 calibration and purported validation for GLEAMS,</p> <p>19 yes.</p> <p>20 Q Let me hand you what's marked as Exhibit No. 03:42PM</p> <p>21 9, sir, and if you can identify that for the Record.</p> <p>22 A Paper published in the same journal in 2007,</p> <p>23 transactions of the AS -- no. Made a mistake.</p> <p>24 Transactions of the ASABE, and that is American</p> <p>25 Society of Agricultural &amp; Biological Engineers in 03:43PM</p>	<p>1 Q Okay. Would you turn to the third page over</p> <p>2 on Page 2083, sir? Under the first column there is</p> <p>3 a title that says Watershed Assessment Model; do you</p> <p>4 see that, sir?</p> <p>5 A Yes. 03:45PM</p> <p>6 Q Okay. Would you read that paragraph? Take a</p> <p>7 moment to read that and I'll ask you a few</p> <p>8 questions.</p> <p>9 A Should I read it out loud?</p> <p>10 Q It's up to you. 03:45PM</p> <p>11 A I'll read it out loud consistent with the</p> <p>12 others.</p> <p>13 Q Thank you.</p> <p>14 A Watershed Assessment Model, in paren, WAM,</p> <p>15 W-A-M. WAM's function is to serve as a tool for 03:45PM</p> <p>16 watershed assessment, using the appropriate model</p> <p>17 components and available data sources, in parens,</p> <p>18 SWET, comma, 2004. SWET is S-W-E-T. Next sentence,</p> <p>19 WAM includes four nutrients submodels for different</p> <p>20 land uses. The groundwater loading effects of 03:46PM</p> <p>21 agricultural management systems, in paren, GLEAMS</p> <p>22 model, in paren, Leonard, et al, 1987, comma, the</p> <p>23 Everglades agricultural area model, in paren,</p> <p>24 E-A-A-M-O-D, all caps, again open paren, SWET, 1996,</p> <p>25 Bottcher, et al, 1998, and Bottcher is spelled 03:46PM</p>
Page 191	Page 193
<p>1 2007. The title is Effect of El Niño/Southern</p> <p>2 Oscillation on Simulated Phosphorus Loading in South</p> <p>3 Florida. Senior author is V. W. Keener,</p> <p>4 K-E-E-N-E-R.</p> <p>5 Q Again, I think that's the same society that 03:44PM</p> <p>6 published the paper in Exhibit 8; correct?</p> <p>7 A No. I thought it was, but I was mistaken.</p> <p>8 Exhibit 8 was American Society of Agricultural</p> <p>9 Engineers. This is American Society of Agricultural</p> <p>10 &amp; Biological Engineers. 03:44PM</p> <p>11 Q Do you know whether or not the American</p> <p>12 Society of Agricultural &amp; Biological Engineers</p> <p>13 simply represents a name change in the previous name</p> <p>14 of American Society of Agricultural Engineers?</p> <p>15 A No, I don't know that. 03:44PM</p> <p>16 Q Do you know whether or not many of the members</p> <p>17 of the American Society of Agricultural &amp; Biological</p> <p>18 Engineers focused their research and scientific</p> <p>19 activities on upland watershed modeling?</p> <p>20 A I don't know the answer to the question 03:44PM</p> <p>21 because I'm not familiar with members of that</p> <p>22 organization.</p> <p>23 Q Have you ever reviewed this paper by Keener</p> <p>24 which is Exhibit No. 9?</p> <p>25 A No, I've never seen this paper. 03:45PM</p>	<p>1 B-O-T-T-C-H-E-R, and two submodels developed by SWET</p> <p>2 specifically for wetland and urban landscapes, in</p> <p>3 paren, SWET 2004. For basin S-191, both GLEAMS and</p> <p>4 EAAMOD were used to simulate daily nutrient loads</p> <p>5 based on recorded land use, precipitation and 03:46PM</p> <p>6 simulated stream flow time series. Stream reaches</p> <p>7 in the model are routed to the outlet by solving the</p> <p>8 continuity equation and Manning's equation for</p> <p>9 uniform channel flow with a variable timestamp of</p> <p>10 approximately 15 minutes based on the simulated 03:47PM</p> <p>11 stream velocity, open paren, see Jacobson and</p> <p>12 Bottcher, 1998, for details, closed paren. WAM</p> <p>13 simulated nutrient loads in 85 defined stream</p> <p>14 reaches in basin S-191, which ultimately merge at a</p> <p>15 single reach, reach 2, which enters Lake Okeechobee, 03:47PM</p> <p>16 references to Figure 1B.</p> <p>17 Q Based on this description, sir, does it appear</p> <p>18 take the WAM model incorporates GLEAMS and some</p> <p>19 other runoff components with a routing equation in</p> <p>20 order to determine phosphorus loading to the water 03:47PM</p> <p>21 body?</p> <p>22 MR. BOND: Object to the form.</p> <p>23 A What I get from reading this paragraph is that</p> <p>24 the modeling system uses GLEAMS in conjunction with</p> <p>25 EAAMOD, but I can't determine in any detail exactly 03:48PM</p>

49 (Pages 190 to 193)

**VICTOR BIERMAN, PhD, Vol II, 4-15-09**

259

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

W. A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his )  
capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL )  
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and )  
OKLAHOMA SECRETARY OF THE )  
ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT, )  
in his capacity as the )  
TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES )  
FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, )

Plaintiff, )

vs. )

4:05-CV-00329-TCK-SAJ

TYSON FOODS, INC., et al, )

Defendants. )

-----  
VOLUME II OF THE VIDEOTAPED  
DEPOSITION OF VICTOR BIERMAN, PhD, produced as  
a witness on behalf of the Plaintiff in the above  
styled and numbered cause, taken on the 15th day of  
April, 2009, in the City of Tulsa, County of Tulsa,  
State of Oklahoma, before me, Lisa A. Steinmeyer, a  
Certified Shorthand Reporter, duly certified under  
and by virtue of the laws of the State of Oklahoma.

**TULSA FREELANCE REPORTERS  
918-587-2878**

## VICTOR BIERMAN, PhD, Vol II, 4-15-09

<p>1 source? I still don't think you've answered my 2 question.</p> <p>3 A The South Florida Water Management model 4 represents the -- both overland flow entering the 5 Everglades, as well as flow entering the canals. It 09:17AM 6 also represents groundwater. Those are three -- 7 there are four sources by which water can enter the 8 Everglades. I just listed three. The fourth is --</p> <p>9 Q But I'm asking you about overland flow.</p> <p>10 A And I told you -- my answer is that we used 09:17AM 11 the surface flows computed by the South Florida 12 Water Management model and data, phosphorus data for 13 boundary concentrations, multiplied the two 14 together, and that's how we determined the 15 phosphorus inputs due to overland flow and we did 09:18AM 16 the same thing for the canals and the same thing for 17 the groundwaters.</p> <p>18 Q Are the processes that talk about overland 19 flow in the South Florida Water Management model 20 described in this paper? 09:18AM</p> <p>21 A They're not described in this paper. That 22 paper -- that work is included by reference in 23 several locations because we relied upon that model 24 and its outputs.</p> <p>25 Q Did you develop that model, the South Florida 09:18AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">280</p>	<p>1 Q Let me tell you what I'm struck on and maybe 2 you can help me clear it up. Yesterday I asked you 3 what experience you had, in particular any 4 peer-reviewed publications where you actually did 5 work on overland field type runoff contributions of 09:20AM 6 phosphorus, and I believe you referenced this paper 7 as a publication.</p> <p>8 A That's correct.</p> <p>9 Q And what I discovered, I believe through this 10 examination this morning, is that the work on the 09:20AM 11 runoff itself was not done by you or your office; it 12 was done by someone else; is that not correct?</p> <p>13 A Not completely. The work -- the hydrologic 14 model was done by South Florida Water Management 15 District. We used results from that model. We then 09:20AM 16 inside our model spatial domain routed water and 17 routed phosphorus inside these spatial cells across 18 overland areas and through canals.</p> <p>19 Q Okay, and so the folks that actually 20 determined the quantity of field runoff was the 09:20AM 21 South Florida Water Management folks; is that 22 correct?</p> <p>23 A Yes, that's correct.</p> <p>24 Q And they were the ones that also identified 25 the particular sources of field runoff for 09:21AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">282</p>
<p>1 Water Management model?</p> <p>2 A No, I did not develop that model.</p> <p>3 Q Who did?</p> <p>4 A The South Florida Water Management District 5 staff developed it. It's a very sophisticated tool. 09:18AM 6 It's very data rich.</p> <p>7 Q You've answered my --</p> <p>8 A Many staff and many years have been spent 9 developing and calibrating that model to south 10 Florida. 09:18AM</p> <p>11 Q But the overland portion of this work in this 12 paper was performed by someone else, not you or your 13 office; is that correct?</p> <p>14 MR. BOND: Object to the form.</p> <p>15 A The overland hydraulics at the boundaries to 09:19AM 16 specify loads were developed by others. The 17 phosphorus mass balance model that we developed here 18 represents phosphorus movement in the three-by-three 19 cells, the overland areas and the canals within the 20 Everglades. That work was done by my office, and 09:19AM 21 that's what this model represents. We need -- I 22 think we're stuck here on is the difference between 23 how did we put data into this model and what the 24 model itself actually represents inside the 25 Everglades. This model is of the Everglades. 09:19AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">281</p>	<p>1 phosphorus also; correct?</p> <p>2 A Into this model domain, that's correct.</p> <p>3 Q Okay, and they also -- well, I think that 4 answers my question. And do you know, sir, from 5 your work on this project what the urban 09:21AM 6 contribution was, that is, the percentage?</p> <p>7 A No, I don't.</p> <p>8 Q The agricultural percentage?</p> <p>9 A No. Those weren't objectives of our work, and 10 I don't know the answers. 09:21AM</p> <p>11 Q Okay. Was there a septic tank contribution 12 considered as part of the contribution?</p> <p>13 A We didn't consider it explicitly. It may have 14 been included implicitly in the boundary conditions, 15 but I don't know that for sure. 09:21AM</p> <p>16 Q What about wildlife?</p> <p>17 A Again, that may have been considered 18 implicitly in the boundary conditions. We did not 19 consider it explicitly in the study.</p> <p>20 Q Illegal dumping? 09:22AM</p> <p>21 A I didn't consider illegal dumping.</p> <p>22 Q Recreational use, contributions of phosphorus 23 from recreational use?</p> <p>24 A Included implicitly in the model inputs, as 25 would illegal dumping actually. 09:22AM</p> <p style="text-align: center;">283</p>

7 (Pages 280 to 283)

**TULSA FREELANCE REPORTERS**  
**918-587-2878**